



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,305	01/13/2004	Bruce M. Harper	004085.P035	5362
7590 10/17/2007				
Daniel E. Ovanezian				
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP				
Seventh Floor				
12400 Wilshire Boulevard				
Los Angeles, CA 90025				
		EXAMINER		
		WOLLSCHLAGER, JEFFREY MICHAEL		
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1791		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		10/17/2007		PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/758,305	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HARPER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeff Wollschlager	<b>Art Unit</b> 1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's amendment to the claims filed June 15, 2007 has been entered. Claims 15, 17, 20, and 24 are currently amended. Claims 1-3 and 25-33 were previously canceled. Claims 14-24 are pending and under examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14-16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thomas et al. (U.S. Patent 5,322,987).

Regarding claim 14, Thomas et al. disclose a method of etching optical servo tracks on a magnetic disk wherein a disk (11) containing a hub (12) with holes (13) and (14) is positioned over a nest/spindle wherein bursts of compressed gas is applied to in such a manner as to rotate the disk and lift the disk off the spindle to form a gas boundary layer to protect it from scratching (col. 3, lines 16-37; col. 4, lines 11-62; Figures 1B, 1C and 2). The examiner notes that by directing sufficient gas pressure to lift the disk (11), comprising the thicker hub (12) section to form a gas boundary layer such that it is not scratched by pin (17), at least a portion of gas flows into the inner diameter holes (Figures 1C and 2).

As to claims 15 and 16, Thomas et al. disclose that a plurality of gas jets (18) are employed to pickup the disk (Figure 2). The examiner notes that a Bernoulli effect is created to lift the disk.

Art Unit: 1791

As to claim 19, Thomas et al. disclose the disk is centered (col. 4, lines 23-25).

Claims 14-16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tzur et al. (U.S. Patent 5,293,287).

Regarding claim 14, Tzur et al. employ a method of stabilizing a flexible optical medium wherein disks (20) and (22) with holes (70) are positioned within a disk drive/nest and wherein the disks are guided into position by directing gas into the inner diameter holes (Figure 10; col. 1, lines 16-27; col. 5, lines 17-37; col. 6, lines 2-13).

As to claims 15, 16, and 18, Tzur et al. create a Bernoulli effect to lift the disks (col. 5, lines 17-37 and col. 6, lines 2-13).

As to claim 19, the hole (46) in the center of the disk is utilized to center the disk upon a drive spindle.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 1791

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0025408) in view of Granneman et al. (WO 98/01890) and Wu et al. (J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B Vol. 16, No. 6, Nov/Dec 1998, pages 3825-3829).

Regarding claim 14, Davis teaches a method of nano-imprinting an embossable film upon a disk, such as optical, magnetic and magneto-optic disks by heating the disk prior to placing/positioning the disk in the mold/nest (Abstract; paragraphs [0004-0006; 0072-0079]. Davis does not expressly state the disk has a hole defined by an inner diameter edge nor that gas is directed into an inner diameter of the hole.

However, Grannemen et al. disclose a method and apparatus for contactless preheating of a substrate by directing gas at the substrate to both heat the substrate and to support it within the apparatus (Abstract; Figures 1 and 2) and Wu et al. demonstrate that magnetic disks, suitable for nanoimprint lithography contain a hole as claimed (Figure 1 and Figure 2).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to preheat the disk disclosed by Davis, containing a hole as evidenced by Wu et al., with the method disclosed by Grannemen et al. for the purpose of preheating the disk for the purpose as disclosed by Grannemen et al. of uniformly heating the disk with no thermal stresses being produced (page 7, lines 37-38). The examiner notes that by placing the disk disclosed by Davis in the apparatus disclosed by Grannemen et al., gas is directed into the inner diameter hole of the disk.

As to claims 15-18 and 23, Grannemen et al. employ a modified Bernoulli head arrangement above and below the substrate to allow the substrate to be heated uniformly without being contacted by the apparatus. The method employs a plurality of gas jets directed

Art Unit: 1791

toward the surface of the disk, including the hole within the disk, and suspends the disk into close proximity of the manifold (Figures 1 and 2).

As to claims 19, Davis discloses placing the disk within a mold. This is understood to center the disk within the nest/mold. Alternatively, one having ordinary skill would have been motivated to place the disk within a centered position of the mold to ensure the stamping procedure provided uniform results.

As to claims 20 and 21, Davis discloses the disk is preheated to an embossing temperature (Abstract; paragraph [0072-0079]).

As to claim 22, Davis discloses the disk is nano-imprinted (paragraphs [0072-0079]).

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0025408) in view of Granneman et al. (WO 98/01890) and Wu et al. (J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B Vol. 16, No. 6, Nov/Dec 1998, pages 3825-3829), as applied to claims 14-23 above, and further in view Bailey et al. (U.S. Patent 6,696,220).

As to claim 24, the combined references teach method of claim 19 as discussed above, but do not expressly disclose further positioning/centering by engaging the outer dimension of the disk with a plurality of rods coupled to actuators. However, Bailey et al. disclose an analogous method of centering a substrate with a plurality of rods coupled to actuators (e.g. piezo actuators; Figure 51 (5103); Figure 38; col. 25, lines 17-37).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to employ the piezo actuators disclosed by Bailey et al. while practicing the method disclosed by Davis for the purpose of providing fine adjustment and positioning of the disk prior to performing the nano-imprinting step as is routinely practiced in the art.

***Response to Arguments***

The examiner notes that the rejection of the claims over Thomas et al. has been updated in response to applicant's amendment which has overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection of certain claims.

Applicant's arguments filed June 15, 2007 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument is essentially that the air which necessarily enters the inner diameter hole in both Thomas et al. and Tzur is a passive result and therefore does not meet the limitation "directing". The examiner submits that applicant's argument is narrower in scope than that which is reasonably encompassed by the claim under a broad reasonable interpretation. The examiner agrees that the instant specification discloses subject matter which can be employed to overcome the Thomas et al. and Tzur references. However, the claims as currently presented are not so limited. It is the examiner's position that the claims would need to be amended to distinguish over Thomas et al. and Tzur.

Additionally, applicant argues that there has been no motivation set forth to combine Granneman with Davis. In response, the examiner notes the motivation statement provided in the rejection above. Additionally, the examiner notes that by directing gas along the surface as shown in Granneman air is also directed into the inner diameter hole. The examiner further notes that the claims do not exclude directing air at locations other than the hole of the disk as long as gas is directed into the hole.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Kraus (WO 00/50321) (Figures and Abstract).

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Wollschlager whose telephone number is 571-272-8937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:00 - 4:45, alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on 571-272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JW

Jeff Wollschlager  
Examiner  
AU 1791

October 5, 2007

CT  
CHRISTINA JOHNSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER